REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-11, 16 and 17 were pending in the application. Applicants have newly added Claims 18 and 19 which parallel previously presented claims and add no new matter hereto. No fee is believed due for the addition of two dependent claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 8-11 and 16-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janik in view of Gibbs and further in view of Mousseau. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited art.

The present invention provides an electronic device and device method for analyzing incoming messages, classifying the incoming messages based on the analysis, and routing the incoming messages to output units based on the message classifying. The classifying is done dynamically and is not based on any pre-determined message classification(s). The classifying is based on at least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level. The independent claims expressly recite routing based on message analysis and dynamic classification.

The Janik patent publication teaches a system and method for providing content to a user based on user preferences. All content in the Janik system "is arranged for delivery…(with) graphical icons…content objects 20, that exist on content selection web page 22, to be dragged and dropped onto content editors on a PC 34" (see: page 5, paragraph [0074]). All content is, therefore, associated with pre-determined content classes and is tagged with content objects. A user inputs preferences regarding pre-determined content types to a web-based system and "only content objects 20 that relate to the selected content types are displayed to the user" (see: page 6, paragraph [0082]). When a user wants to download content, the user drags and drops the content objects onto content editors on the user's PC. Thereafter, the core module at the user's PC manages the downloading and delivery of the selected, pre-classified content. Core module features are detailed in Janik at paragraphs [0096]-[0114] and include retrieval, caching, clocking and serving; but do not include any analysis of message content.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Janik does not teach a plurality of interfaces and does not teach a message classification process comprising analysis of messages and dynamic configuration of messages based on at

least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level.

The Examiner has newly cited the Gibbs patent publication for its teachings regarding a content analyzer 130 with classifier 132 (see: Fig. 1 of Gibbs). The Gibbs patent teaches "a system and methodology that provides for adjusting content that is to be received and displayed by a device so that the content is meaningful to the recipient" [0005]. Gibbs does not teach or suggest that messages be routed based on message classification. Rather, messages are modified based on the capabilities of the intended recipient device and then routed to the intended recipient device. The Gibbs modification of messages is limited by content provider constraints on the adjustment of content [0006]. Further, the Gibbs content classification and modification may be influenced by user personalization feedback from intended recipients. In all of the Gibbs teachings, a message is never re-routed. The message is sent to the intended recipient device, although the content of that message may be altered based on the capabilities of the intended recipient device and the constraints established by the content provider.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Gibbs patent publication does not provide the teachings which are

missing from the Janik patent publication. While Gibbs does include a content analyzer, the Gibbs' content analyzer is not classifying a message based on at least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level. Rather, the Gibbs content analyzer seeks to identify the display components of the message as they relate to the output capabilities of the intended recipient device, as retrieved from the Device Capabilities Store 152 of Abstraction Layer 150. Accordingly, Gibbs is determining if the message has a graphic component (e.g., a picture of an automobile, paragraph [0057]) or an audio component, etc. and then checks the Device Capabilities Store to determine if the intended recipient device has the corresponding output capability. If not, then the Gibbs' Content Control System 102 removes the message component (e.g., the graphic or audio) from the message prior to sending the message to the intended recipient device. There is no teaching or suggestion in Gibbs that a preferred output unit be determined or that a message be re-routed to a determined preferred output unit for maximal rendering rather than being altered. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the Gibbs patent publication does not provide the teachings which are missing from Janik and further assert that if one having skill in the art were

motivated to modify Janik with Gibbs, one would arrive at a Janik system that allows a user to select pre-determined content types/preferences, selects content to send the user based on the pre-determined content types, and then modifies the content based on the user's device display capabilities. The combination would not result in the invention as claimed.

The Examiner has further acknowledged that the combination of Janik and Gibbs fails to disclose a method of determining an output unit for rendering a received message based on dynamic message classification. The Examiner newly cites the Mousseau patent publication stating that Mousseau "discloses a method for redirecting message attachments between a host system and a mobile data communication device wherein a redirector determines a path for content that is input from a host system and directs it to a compatible output device. Applicants respectfully assert that the Mousseau patent publication does not teach the claim features which are missing from the combination of Janik and Gibbs. Mousseau neither teaches nor suggests automatic redirection based on automatic content analysis. What Mousseau teaches in paragraphs [0015] and [0016] is that redirection is done in response to receipt of redirection input (trigger event 58 of Fig. 4 and

redirection input 232 of Fig. 7 based on initial user configuration or express user input 86 of Fig. 5 and 260 of Fig. 8). Mousseau does not teach or suggest automatic, dynamic determination of a preferred output device based on dynamic automatic message classification or routing to a determined preferred output device based on dynamic message classification. Accordingly, Applicants contend that the addition of the Mousseau teachings to the combination of Janik and Gibbs does not result in the invention as claimed.

For a determination of obviousness, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art" (*In re Wilson*, 424 F. 2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970). If the cited references fail to teach each and every one of the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner. Since none of the Janik, Gibbs and Mousseau patent publications teaches the claimed steps and means for determining routing of messages based on dynamic message classification, as claimed, obviousness has not been established with respect to the language of independent Claims 1, 10 and 17 or of

any of the claims that depend therefrom and add limitations thereto.

In response to the rejection of Claim 2, Applicants respectfully contend that the Janik teachings related to storing predefined subclasses of content for user preference selection neither teach nor suggest a stored look-up table having confidentiality classification levels for message rendering output units. Further, in response to the rejection of Claims 3 and 11 and newly added Claim 18, Applicants contend that none of Janik, Gibbs or Mousseau teaches that a message is classified by a classification unit and that the classification result is provided.

With regard to the rejections of Claims 8 and 16, and the corresponding subject matter recited in newly added Claim 19, Applicants assert that the Mousseau teaching regarding determining connected output units is not the same as or suggestive of the claimed step/means for identifying available connected message rendering output units and for making the control unit determine only one or more of said identified available message rendering output units for message routing. Mousseau is checking whether identified devices are connected. In contrast, the present invention is identifying a group of available output

devices from which at least one preferred message rendering output unit can be determined for routing based on the automatic dynamic message classification process. Simply determining connectivity and waiting for user redirection input, as does Mousseau, does not obviate the invention as set forth in Claims 8, 16 and 19.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejections, and issuance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Bourges-Waldegg

By: */Anne Vachon Dougherty/*
Anne Vachon Dougherty
Reg. No. 30,374
Tel. (914) 962-5910